

This ground of rejection is not understood by Applicant. Since two layers are recited, it should be apparent that the first layer is an inner layer with respect to the outer layer, and the outer layer is both "outer" with respect to the inner layer. A suggestion from the Examiner would be appreciated.

Examiner has rejected claims 4 to 6 because the ingredients are identified in terms of their tradenames, rather than their chemical names. Accordingly, claims 4 to 6 have been canceled, to be replaced by claims 7, 8, and 9 in which the generic names of the ingredients are recited.

Examiner has rejected claims 1 to 3 under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mero, Patent No. 6,166,852, in lieu of Pavelka, et. al., Patent No. 5,387,458.

This is essentially the same rejection Examiner has made in the parent application, and Applicant submits a copy of a response to office letter of November 20, 2000 in parent application Serial No.: 09/849,884. The argument of Applicant commences in the last paragraph in page 4. In his next response, Examiner did not pursue this rejection, stating that it was "moot", and the case went to appeal based solely upon the question of adequate disclosure. At the time of filing Examiner's answer, Examiner made no reference to this ground of rejection.

In the light of the above amendment and remarks, reconsideration of Examiner's position is requested, and further and favorable action is earnestly solicited. If Examiner considers amplification of claim 1, he is requested to clearly indicate what language is considered adequate.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles E. Temko

Charles E. Temko
Attorney for Applicant

22 Marion Road
Westport, CT 06880
(203) 227-7368

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C.

20231 on 10/5/04

Dated 10/5/04 By: Charles E. Temko